

[Counsel identified on signature pages]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

NATIONAL URBAN LEAGUE, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

WILBUR L. ROSS, JR., et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 5:20-cv-05799-LHK

**JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT  
STATEMENT**

Date: January 11, 2021

Time: 3 p.m.

Place: Courtroom 8

Judge: Hon. Lucy H. Koh

Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 16-10(d) and the Court's January 4, 2021 Case Management Order (Dkt. 427), the parties to this action, by their respective counsel, respectfully submit the following Joint Case Management Statement in anticipation of the Further Case Management Conference scheduled for January 11, 2021 at 3 p.m.

## **I. DOCUMENT PRODUCTIONS**

### **Plaintiffs' Position**

#### **A. *Plaintiffs' Renewed Motion to Compel and for Sanctions Regarding Summary Data Reports/Defendants' Ongoing Failure to Produce Data Responsive to Plaintiffs' Sufficient-to-Show Requests for Production***

In accordance with the briefing schedule set forth in the January 4 Case Management Order (Dkt. 427), on January 5, 2021, Plaintiffs filed their Renewed Motion to Compel and for Sanctions regarding Defendants' continual failure to provide summary data reports responsive to Plaintiffs' sufficient-to-show requests regarding data collection processes, metrics, issues, and improprieties. *See* Dkt. 433. Plaintiffs' motion is fully briefed and pending before the Magistrate Judge Panel. Dkt. 440.

As of the time of this filing, Defendants have still not identified a single Bates number of previously produced materials containing the Court-ordered data and have not otherwise cured their failure to produce the requisite data in accordance with the Court's Order to Compel. Dkt. 372, 380.

#### **B. *Missing Documents***

As described in the parties' December 30 and January 4 Joint Status Reports (Dkt. 417, 424), Plaintiffs are *still* waiting for a large but tailored set of critical materials Defendants have never produced, despite agreement and Court order. Defendants' failures to date already caused the Court to extend the fact discovery cut-off to January 21, 2021. They continue to stonewall.

The parties discussed these ongoing issues with the Court at the January 4, 2021 Case Management Conference, where the Court underscored Defendants' "ongoing discovery obligations," particularly as facts pertaining to newly discovered Census anomalies change. Jan. 4, 2021 Hr'g Tr. at 31:3-15. The Court emphasized that Defendants' "discovery obligation is ongoing as facts on the ground change, that it can't just be the frozen snapshot" based on data

collection done earlier in December. *Id.* Defendants averred that they “of course underst[ood] that [their] discovery obligations are ongoing.” *Id.* at 31:20-21. Despite that clear representation, Defendants have not produced a single new document to Plaintiffs since December 31, 2020. As a result, the pressing open items regarding Defendants’ missing productions that Plaintiffs identified in the January 4 Joint Status Report remain outstanding. Plaintiffs reiterate these open items below:

**1. Failure to produce recent documents, but instead decide to make mid/late December *en masse* productions that had arbitrary cutoffs in November**

- The vast bulk of materials produced between December 14-21, as compelled by the Court in its December 13 Order, had arbitrary cut-offs in November. Defendants have said they are looking to update their productions, but have provided no date certain for completion as of yet. While, as described below, Defendants produced a small number of updated documents in late December, Plaintiffs have not received fully updated productions for any custodian. Nor have Plaintiffs received any documents regarding the latest plans, including processing plans and new anomalies discovered, discussed at the January 4, 2021 conference.

**2. Failure to produce any documents from key custodians (Olson, Lamas) contrary to discovery schedule and representations to Court**

- In their December 31, 2020 production, Defendants finally produced some materials from these important custodians, after Plaintiffs raised the issue with the Court. But once again, the production is largely ethereal (i.e., only 172 documents from Tim Olson, the head of NRFU), and nowhere close to complete. Moreover, initial review of these materials indicates, yet again, a vast trove of largely irrelevant materials, such as mass marketing emails and news mailers. *Defendants have not produced any additional documents for Olson or Lamas since December 31, and Plaintiffs are still awaiting complete productions for these custodians.*

**3. Failure to produce documents from known sources of key materials—i.e., EGG (Data Quality Executive Guidance Group networked source repository and email list; OIG shared drive repository; enumerator complaint and communications emails/repositories**

- Defendants still have produced nothing from these core sources, particularly from the EGG networked source repository and email list—a group that Albert Fontenot has previously claimed, to this Court, was formed precisely to “provide direction and approvals about quality assessments of changes to the operational plans and of the 2020 Census data during and after the data collection process.” Dkt. 323-1 at 5. There is no way Defendants did not know about the EGG, its email list, and its networked location—and their deliberate decision to not produce materials from it is highly troubling.

**4. Failure to produce any documents from 10 of the identified custodians, contrary to agreement**

- In an effort to reach a good-faith compromise on open items, Plaintiffs told Defendants that these materials could take a backseat to the far more pressing items referenced above. Given their intransigence on even the materials above, Plaintiffs believe that Defendants are planning to never produce anything from this set.

To put Defendants’ ongoing approach into perspective, Defendants have produced *only 1,241 new documents since December 21*, and nothing at all in all of January:

***December 23, 2020 Production: 50 Documents Total***

<b>Custodian</b>	<b>Number of Documents</b>
Abowd, John Maron	2
Ahmad, Ali	2
Christy, James	1
Cogley, Nathaniel	2
Jones, Christa	2
Kelley, Karen Dunn	1
Risko, Daniel	23
Walsh, Michael	17

***December 26, 2020 Production: 39 Documents Total***

<b>Custodian</b>	<b>Number of Documents</b>
Ahmad, Ali	9
Cogley, Nathaniel	4
Kelley, Karen Dunn	1
Risko, Daniel	8
Ross (WLR) Wilbur L.	1
Sprung, Michael	1
Thieme, Michael	1
Walsh, Michael	13
Mayfield, Earl	1

**December 30, 2020 Production: 84 Documents Total**

<b>Custodian</b>	<b>Number of Documents</b>
"Census Bureau"	84

**December 31, 2020 Production: 1068 Documents Total**

<b>Custodian</b>	<b>Number of Documents</b>
Lamas, Enrique	871
Olson, Tim	172
Census Bureau	25

Plaintiffs waited weeks before filing their renewed motion to compel and for sanctions regarding Defendants' failure to produce the Court-ordered summary data reports. Plaintiffs did so because Defendants had apparently finally begun to indicate they would comply, but that was not so, as Defendants' arguments in their opposition last week made clear (including the claim that Defendants apparently did not understand that actual data reports from their databases were ever going to be at issue in this case). With respect to the remaining discovery deficiencies outlined above, Plaintiffs now believe Defendants are taking the same road: delay, leading to prejudice. The Court will recall that last week, Defendants themselves suggested a schedule where they would work to produce the remaining discovery materials owed and all document discovery would end by January 7. That was 4 days ago. Defendants have produced nothing in all of January

Accordingly, Plaintiffs have no choice but seek further relief from the Magistrate Judge Panel. Pursuant to the Court's January 4, 2021 Case Management Order (Dkt. 427), Plaintiffs will be reaching out to the Magistrate Judge Panel regarding this briefing and, subject to the Panel's preferences, expect to file their motion to compel covering these issues this week.

**Defendants' Position**

As detailed in Defendants' response to Plaintiffs' "renewed" motion to compel, Defendants complied fully with the Court's December 13, 2020, Order to Compel. That dispute is currently pending before the Magistrate Judge panel, such that Defendants do not see the need to repeat the substance of their response here. In the meantime, Defendants are continuing to update their document collections, and expect to make additional productions as soon as

1 practically possible. Defendants expect these productions to contain updated materials  
 2 concerning the anomalies that the Census Bureau has encountered in its data processing, as well  
 3 as other information concerning data quality for the 2020 census and the schedule for delivering  
 4 apportionment results. Defendants continue to be willing to work in good faith with Plaintiffs to  
 5 resolve any disputes, and will respond in due course to any additional motions that Plaintiffs  
 6 choose to file.

## 7 **II. PRIVILEGE LOGS AND RELATED DISPUTES**

### 8 **Plaintiffs' Position**

9 As discussed in the parties' December 22, December 30, and January 4 Joint Status  
 10 Reports, (Dkt. 402, 417, 424), it is now clear that Defendants intentionally failed to log (and  
 11 indeed apparently never even looked at) a significant number of documents which do not include  
 12 a litigation attorney. Those include a number of documents that do not include any attorney at  
 13 all, but instead hit on a broad search term, such as "attorney client" or "work product," as well as  
 14 a number of documents that include DOC attorneys that do not serve as litigation counsel for this  
 15 lawsuit. It is unheard of for parties to carve out documents that simply contain such terms or  
 16 non-litigation counsel and *never even look at or log them*, but pretend that they never existed.  
 17 As the Court will recall, Plaintiffs were extremely surprised when—out of a potentially  
 18 privileged universe of over 25,000 documents, Defendants produced a log of 135 entries alone.  
 19 Defendants represented then that their log was just small. Mass, improper carve-outs as  
 20 described above appear to be the reason.

21 Additionally, as set forth in the parties' December 22, December 30, and January 4 Joint  
 22 Status Reports (Dkt. 402, 417, 424), Plaintiffs have for weeks sought information regarding a  
 23 subset of 2,944 documents that declarant Brian DiGiacomo identified on December 12 as "likely  
 24 subject to Executive privilege. The parties' ongoing discussions have been frustrating and  
 25 characterized by Defendants' ever-changing numbers and information surrounding this universe  
 26 of documents. In a January 8, 2021 letter to Plaintiffs, Defendants finally provided answers to  
 27 some, but not all, of Plaintiffs' inquiries. Defendants admitted that numbers included in the  
 28 earlier DiGiacomo declarations to the Court were simply wrong. At this point, Plaintiffs are not

1 certain whether further back-and-forth on the Executive privilege and carve-out universes of  
 2 documents will be productive, in light of the significant other front-burner discovery items and  
 3 Defendants' failure to produce. But Defendants' incorrect representations to Plaintiffs and the  
 4 Court regarding the Executive privilege document universe further underscore that Defendants  
 5 have improperly withheld and failed to log large swaths of documents that are in fact not  
 6 privileged.

7 For weeks, Plaintiffs have patiently sought information regarding Defendants' privilege  
 8 assertions and thousands of withheld documents. Plaintiffs have given Defendants numerous  
 9 opportunities to provide the requested information, and have agreed to several compromises in  
 10 an effort to avoid involving the Court.<sup>1</sup> However, after months of delay and obfuscation,  
 11 Defendants have not agreed to properly review and log the thousands of documents that they  
 12 claim may be privileged (but have not even reviewed themselves). Fact discovery concludes in  
 13 this case on January 21, 2021.

14 Accordingly, as to this issue, too, Plaintiffs have no choice but seek further relief from  
 15 the Magistrate Judge Panel. Pursuant to the Court's January 4, 2021 Case Management Order  
 16 (Dkt. 427), Plaintiffs will be reaching out to the Magistrate Judge Panel regarding motion  
 17 briefing on this issue and plan to file their motion for waiver of privilege over all improperly  
 18 carved-out documents later today or tomorrow.

### 19 **Defendants' Position**

20  
 21 Defendants have worked closely with Plaintiffs' counsel to provide them with the  
 22 information they have requested, both with respect to documents involving the Executive office  
 23 of the President, and with respect to Defendants' litigation carve-out. Most recently, in a letter  
 24 \_\_\_\_\_

25 <sup>1</sup> As the Court will recall, Plaintiffs have been ready to file a motion for further relief  
 26 regarding these privilege issues for almost two weeks. In a showing of good faith based on  
 27 Defendants' repeated representations that they would promptly provide clarifying information  
 28 regarding these documents, Plaintiffs successfully asked the Court several times to extend their  
 deadline to move for relief. *See* Dkt. 410, Dkt. 419; *see also* Dkt. 422 (Defendants' January 3  
 notice and request to extend Plaintiffs' motion deadline beyond January 4, 2021); Dkt. 427 (Case  
 Management Order vacating January 4, 2021 deadline and directing parties to coordinate motion  
 briefing schedule with Magistrate Judge Panel).

1 dated January 8, 2021, Defendants provided detailed information in response to Plaintiffs' latest  
 2 set of questions. While Plaintiffs in their questions indicated that they were seeking to avoid  
 3 motion practice through continued conferral between the parties, they have apparently chosen to  
 4 bypass that route, even after Defendants provided the requested information. Defendants are  
 5 open, and have continually been open, to a negotiated resolution of this dispute; should Plaintiffs  
 6 choose to burden the Court with motion practice, Defendants will respond in due course.

### 7 **III. DEPOSITIONS**

#### 8 **Plaintiffs' Position**

9 Pursuant to the Court's Order to Compel (Dkt. 371, 380), Plaintiffs took the Rule  
 10 30(b)(6) depositions of Defendants Department of Commerce and Census Bureau on December  
 11 17, 2020. As set forth in the Joint Statements filed on December 18, 2020 and December 22,  
 12 2020, Plaintiffs maintain that neither witness was adequately prepared on various aspects of the  
 13 noticed topics. In an effort to resolve these inadequacies, on December 27, 2020, Plaintiffs  
 14 requested that Defendants answer under oath no later than December 30, 2020 a set of four  
 15 tailored questions to address the topics that Defendants' witnesses were unable to answer at their  
 16 depositions. Defendants responded on January 4, 2021 with a declaration from Kathleen Styles  
 17 on behalf of the Census Bureau only. Plaintiffs responded with a letter on January 7, 2021,  
 18 identifying numerous deficiencies that were unaddressed by Ms. Styles declaration, including  
 19 that Defendant Department of Commerce failed to respond at all, and requesting that Defendants  
 20 provide the requested information by close of business on January 8, 2020. To date, Defendants  
 21 have not responded to Plaintiffs' letter.

22 The Department of Commerce Rule 30(b)(6) deposition will take place tomorrow, on  
 23 Tuesday, January 12, 2020, and the Rule 30(b)(6) deposition for Defendant Census Bureau is  
 24 scheduled to take place on Thursday, January 14, 2020. In light of the case schedule, Plaintiffs  
 25 have to move forward with those depositions despite the fact that Defendants have failed to  
 26 produce a critical responsive materials, and from key sources. Because of Defendants' deliberate  
 27 delay, however, Plaintiffs intend to keep the depositions open, should later produced materials or  
 28 discovered information counsel for additional questioning.



1 Plaintiffs expect that, given Defendants’ expansive and unjustified position on the  
 2 “Deliberative Process Privilege” to date, Defendants may seek to improperly prevent questioning  
 3 on key topics or materials. While Plaintiffs hope that any such issues can be worked through by  
 4 counsel, Plaintiffs will be reaching out to the Magistrate Judge Panel today for guidance on how  
 5 best to reach a Judge on the panel, as appropriate, should a real-time decision be needed.

6 Finally, Plaintiffs will be serving the remainder of their three fact witness deposition  
 7 notices this week. However, because Defendants still have failed to produce documents for two  
 8 of Plaintiffs’ priority custodians—Tim Olson and Enrique Lamas—and because Defendants have  
 9 failed to update document productions for any custodians whatsoever, Plaintiffs have been  
 10 unable to adequately assess which individuals they would like to depose. Here, too, time is  
 11 simply running out, and Defendants’ intransigence is forcing Plaintiffs to choose with  
 12 incomplete information. As a result, Plaintiffs may need to reach out to the Court seeking  
 13 additional relief on this issue in the future.

#### 14 **Defendants’ Position**

15 As reflected in Defendants’ prior filings, Defendants maintain that Defendants’ prior  
 16 witnesses were adequately prepared for the depositions. Indeed, the Census Bureau witness  
 17 testified for hours—in great detail—about the nature and functions of the Census Bureau’s data  
 18 systems, and the capability of those systems (or lack thereof) to generate the type of detailed data  
 19 that Plaintiffs have requested. Additionally, Defendants have continued to provide Plaintiffs  
 20 additional information following those depositions—and have provided a sworn declaration from  
 21 a Census Bureau official to answer additional questions. Defendants will continue to work in  
 22 good faith with Plaintiffs on this issue and have told Plaintiffs that they are gathering information  
 23 to respond to additional inquiries; these efforts belie Plaintiffs’ complaints.

24 Plaintiffs’ pre-emptive complaints about depositions that have not yet taken place are  
 25 even more unfounded. Indeed, Plaintiffs’ preemptive promise to “hold open” depositions they  
 26 have neither noticed nor taken is bizarre. And their complaint that they do not know who to  
 27 depose rings hollow in light of their representation that they clearly know who their “priority  
 28 custodians” are. As with the other issues, Defendants will continue to work in good faith with  
 Plaintiffs. It should be noted, however, that the topics Plaintiffs have noticed for deposition are

1 extraordinarily broad and burdensome, and have made the preparations for depositions  
 2 unnecessarily difficult. To the extent Plaintiffs wish to facilitate the expeditious conclusion of  
 3 discovery they should work in good faith with Defendants to narrow those topics to appropriate  
 4 and manageable parameters.

5  
 6  
 7  
 8 Dated: January 11, 2021

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP

9 By: /s/ Sadik Huseny  
 10 Sadik Huseny

11 Sadik Huseny (Bar No. 224659)  
 12 sadik.huseny@lw.com  
 13 Steven M. Bauer (Bar No. 135067)  
 14 steven.bauer@lw.com  
 15 Amit Makker (Bar No. 280747)  
 16 amit.makker@lw.com  
 17 Shannon D. Lankenau (Bar. No. 294263)  
 18 shannon.lankenau@lw.com  
 19 **LATHAM & WATKINS LLP**  
 20 505 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000  
 21 San Francisco, CA 94111  
 22 Telephone: 415.391.0600  
 23 Facsimile: 415.395.8095

18 Melissa Arbus Sherry (*pro hac vice*)  
 19 melissa.sherry@lw.com  
 20 Richard P. Bress (*pro hac vice*)  
 21 rick.bress@lw.com  
 22 Anne W. Robinson (*pro hac vice*)  
 23 anne.robinson@lw.com  
 24 Tyce R. Walters (*pro hac vice*)  
 25 tyce.walters@lw.com  
 26 Gemma Donofrio (*pro hac vice*)  
 27 gemma.donofrio@lw.com  
 28 Christine C. Smith (*pro hac vice*)  
 christine.smith@lw.com  
**LATHAM & WATKINS LLP**  
 555 Eleventh Street NW, Suite 1000  
 Washington, D.C. 20004  
 Telephone: 202.637.2200  
 Facsimile: 202.637.2201

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs National Urban League;  
 League of Women Voters; Black Alliance for  
 Just Immigration; Harris County, Texas; King  
 County, Washington; City of San Jose,*

1 *California; Rodney Ellis; Adrian Garcia; and*  
2 *the NAACP*

3 Dated: January 11, 2021

By: /s/ Jon M. Greenbaum  
Kristen Clarke (*pro hac vice*)  
kclarke@lawyerscommittee.org  
Jon M. Greenbaum (Bar No. 166733)  
jgreenbaum@lawyerscommittee.org  
Ezra D. Rosenberg (*pro hac vice*)  
erosenberg@lawyerscommittee.org  
Ajay Saini (*pro hac vice*)  
asaini@lawyerscommittee.org  
Maryum Jordan (Bar No. 325447)  
mjordan@lawyerscommittee.org  
Pooja Chaudhuri (Bar No. 314847)  
pchaudhuri@lawyerscommittee.org  
**LAWYERS' COMMITTEE FOR CIVIL  
RIGHTS UNDER LAW**  
1500 K Street NW, Suite 900  
Washington, DC 20005  
Telephone: 202.662.8600  
Facsimile: 202.783.0857

13 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs National Urban League;*  
14 *City of San Jose, California; Harris County,*  
15 *Texas; League of Women Voters; King County,*  
16 *Washington; Black Alliance for Just*  
*Immigration; Rodney Ellis; Adrian Garcia; the*  
*NAACP; and Navajo Nation*

17 Wendy R. Weiser (*pro hac vice*)  
18 weiserw@brennan.law.nyu.edu  
19 Thomas P. Wolf (*pro hac vice*)  
20 wolft@brennan.law.nyu.edu  
21 Kelly M. Percival (*pro hac vice*)  
22 percivalk@brennan.law.nyu.edu  
**BRENNAN CENTER FOR JUSTICE**  
120 Broadway, Suite 1750  
New York, NY 10271  
Telephone: 646.292.8310  
Facsimile: 212.463.7308

23 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs National Urban League;*  
24 *City of San Jose, California; Harris County,*  
25 *Texas; League of Women Voters; King County,*  
26 *Washington; Black Alliance for Just*  
*Immigration; Rodney Ellis; Adrian Garcia; the*  
*NAACP; and Navajo Nation*

27 Mark Rosenbaum (Bar No. 59940)  
28 mrosenbaum@publiccounsel.org

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**PUBLIC COUNSEL**

610 South Ardmere Avenue  
Los Angeles, California 90005  
Telephone: 213.385.2977  
Facsimile: 213.385.9089

*Attorneys for Plaintiff City of San Jose*

Doreen McPaul, Attorney General  
dmcpaul@nndoj.org  
Jason Searle (*pro hac vice*)  
jasearle@nndoj.org

**NAVAJO NATION DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

P.O. Box 2010  
Window Rock, AZ 86515  
Telephone: (928) 871-6345

*Attorneys for Navajo Nation*

Dated: January 11, 2021

By: /s/ Danielle Goldstein  
Michael N. Feuer (Bar No. 111529)  
mike.feuer@lacity.org  
Kathleen Kenealy (Bar No. 212289)  
kathleen.kenealy@lacity.org  
Danielle Goldstein (Bar No. 257486)  
danielle.goldstein@lacity.org  
Michael Dundas (Bar No. 226930)  
mike.dundas@lacity.org

**CITY ATTORNEY FOR THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES**

200 N. Main Street, 8th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90012  
Telephone: 213.473.3231  
Facsimile: 213.978.8312

*Attorneys for Plaintiff City of Los Angeles*

Dated: January 11, 2021

By: /s/ Michael Mutalipassi  
Christopher A. Callihan (Bar No. 203010)  
legalwebmail@ci.salinas.ca.us  
Michael Mutalipassi (Bar No. 274858)  
michaelmu@ci.salinas.ca.us

**CITY OF SALINAS**

200 Lincoln Avenue  
Salinas, CA 93901  
Telephone: 831.758.7256  
Facsimile: 831.758.7257

*Attorneys for Plaintiff City of Salinas*

1 Dated: January 11, 2021

By: /s/ Rafey S. Balabanian  
Rafey S. Balabanian (Bar No. 315962)  
rbalabanian@edelson.com  
Lily E. Hough (Bar No. 315277)  
lthough@edelson.com  
**EDELSON P.C.**  
123 Townsend Street, Suite 100  
San Francisco, CA 94107  
Telephone: 415.212.9300  
Facsimile: 415.373.9435

Rebecca Hirsch (*pro hac vice*)  
rebecca.hirsch2@cityofchicago.org  
**CORPORATION COUNSEL FOR THE  
CITY OF CHICAGO**  
Celia Mexa  
Stephen J. Kane  
121 N. LaSalle Street, Room 600  
Chicago, IL 60602  
Telephone: (312) 744-8143  
Facsimile: (312) 744-5185

*Attorneys for Plaintiff City of Chicago*

14 Dated: January 11, 2021

By: /s/ Donald R. Pongrace  
Donald R. Pongrace (*pro hac vice*)  
dpongance@akingump.com  
Merrill C. Godfrey (Bar No. 200437)  
mgodfrey@akingump.com  
**AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD  
LLP**  
2001 K St., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Telephone: (202) 887-4000  
Facsimile: 202-887-4288

*Attorneys for Plaintiff Gila River Indian  
Community*

22 Dated: January 11, 2021

By: /s/ David I. Holtzman  
David I. Holtzman (Bar No. 299287)  
David.Holtzman@hklaw.com  
**HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP**  
Daniel P. Kappes  
Jacqueline N. Harvey  
50 California Street, 28th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Telephone: (415) 743-6970  
Fax: (415) 743-6910

*Attorneys for Plaintiff County of Los Angeles*

1 DATED: January 11, 2021

JEFFREY BOSSERT CLARK  
Acting Assistant Attorney General

2  
3 JOHN V. COGHLAN  
Deputy Assistant Attorney General

4 AUGUST E. FLENTJE  
5 Special Counsel to the Assistant  
6 Attorney General

7 ALEXANDER K. HAAS  
Branch Director

8 DIANE KELLEHER  
9 BRAD P. ROSENBERG  
Assistant Branch Directors

10  
11 /s/ Alexander V. Sverdlov  
ALEXANDER V. SVERDLOV  
12 (New York Bar No. 4918793)  
STEPHEN EHRLICH  
13 M. ANDREW ZEE  
Trial Attorneys  
14 U.S. Department of Justice  
Civil Division - Federal Programs Branch  
15 1100 L Street, NW  
16 Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 305-0550

17 *Attorneys for Defendants*

18  
19  
20 **ATTESTATION**

21 I, Sadik Huseny, am the ECF user whose user ID and password authorized the filing of this  
22 document. Under Civil L.R. 5-1(i)(3), I attest that all signatories to this document have concurred  
23 in this filing.

24  
25 Dated: January 11, 2021

**LATHAM & WATKINS LLP**

26 By: /s/ Sadik Huseny  
Sadik Huseny